

Application No. 10/598,866

Amdt. Dated: March 11, 2009

Reply to Office Action Dated: December 18, 2008

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 4. This sheet, which includes Fig. 4, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 4. In Fig. 4, reference text labels have been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Application No. 10/598,866
Amdt. Dated: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action Dated: December 18, 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the Office Action mailed December 18, 2008. The status of the application is as follows:

- Claims 1-20 are pending, claims 1, 3 and 9-14 have been amended, and claims 15-20 have been added;
- The specification is objected to;
- Figure 4 of the drawings is objected to;
- Claims 11-12 are objected to for informalities;
- Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter;
- Claims 1, 8-9, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Besson (US 6,441,670 B1); and
- Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besson in view of Sohval et al. (US 4,637,040).

The objections and rejections are discussed below.

The Allowed Claims

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 3-7, 10 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claims 1, 9, 11 and 13 has been amended herein to incorporate aspects of allowed claims 3, 10, 12 and 14, respectively. Applicants further reserves the right to re-write claims 3-7, 10 and 12 as indicated by the Examiner at a later time.

The Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to for referring to claims 1-14 on pages 2-5, which may create discrepancies, and new matter issues if future claims amendments were to be made. The specification has been amended herein to remove references to claims 1-14 within the specification. As such, the objection should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/598,866
Amdt. Dated: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action Dated: December 18, 2008

The Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because in Figure 4, the unlabeled boxes S1-S9 shown in the drawings should be provided with descriptive text labels. In view of the foregoing amendments, applicants request withdrawal of this objection.

The Objection to Claims 11-12

Claims 11-12 are objected to for having an undefined abbreviation term "CT." In light of the amendments made herein at the recommendation of the Examiner, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. In particular, the Office asserts that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 13-14 have been amended herein according to the Examiner's recommendations. Hence, the rejection of claims 13-14 should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 8-9, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 8-9, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Besson. **Claim 1** has been amended to include aspects of claim 3, and now further recites: rebinning the first rebinned projection data set from the second geometry to a third geometry, resulting in a second rebinned projection data set. Applicants believe claim 1 is now allowable. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Independent **claims 9, 11 and 13** have also been amended herein to include aspects similar to those incorporated into claim 1. As such, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 13 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 8 and 13 should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/598,866
Amtd. Dated: March 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action Dated: December 18, 2008

The Rejection of Claims 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besson in view of Sohval et al. This rejection should be withdrawn because claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is allowable at least by virtue of this dependency. As such, the rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn.

New Claims 15-20

Newly added claims 15-20 emphasize various aspects. No new matter has been added. The aspects are not a part of the prior art of record. Entry and allowance of claims 15-20 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Katharyn E. Owen/

Katharyn E. Owen, Reg. No. 62,849
Driggs, Hogg, Daugherty & Del Zoppo Co., L.P.A.
38500 Chardon Road
Willoughby Hills, Ohio 44094
Phone: 1.440.391.5100
Fax: 1.440.391.5101

Direct all correspondence to:

Douglas B. McKnight, Reg. No. 50,447
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
595 Miner Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44143
Phone: 1.440.483.2373
Fax: 1.440.483.2452